

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks and the above amendments. This response is believed to fully address all issues raised in the Office Action mailed February 22, 2008. Furthermore, no new matter is believed to have been introduced hereby.

Claims 1-20 were previously pending. Claims 1, 8, and 16 have been amended. Claims 21-23 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-23 remain pending in this application.

Initially, the undersigned attorney would like to thank Examiner Foud for discussing the pending claims and cited art on May 2, 2008. As indicated by the Interview Summary mailed on May 12, 2008, amendments to the claims that would overcome the outstanding rejections outlined in the outstanding Office Action mailed February 22, 2008, were discussed.

To this end, without limiting the scope of embodiments of the invention, only in an effort to impart precision to the claims (e.g., by more particularly pointing out embodiments of the invention, rather than to avoid prior art), and merely to expedite the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has amended all independent claims 1, 8, and 16 to in part recite that the claimed storage device is to only store data to be communicated between the host and the network. It is believed that the pending claims clearly distinguish the receiving buffers of Lay's switch which store general network traffic and are not to only store a certain type of data as recited in the independent claims.

Also, all pending dependent claims should be allowable for at least similar reasons as their respective independent claims, as well as additional or alternative elements that are recited therein but not shown in the cited prior art.

For example, claims 21-23 are believed to further distinguish the cited art, e.g., by further defining the location of the claimed storage device with reference to a switch, a hub, or a host interface. This is very different from the cited art. More particularly, as discussed with the Examiner, Lay appears to merely associate its receiving buffers with its switch and fails to teach (or even suggest) the configurations set forth in any of the claims 21-23.

Lastly, objection to the abstract is believed to be moot in light of the above-detailed amendment to the abstract.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (720-840-6740) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 50890

Telephone Number: 720-840-6740

Date May 22, 2008

By /Ramin Aghevli/
Ramin Aghevli
Reg. No. 43,462